DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This office action is in response to applicant's amendment filed, 18 March 2010, of application filed, with the above serial number, on 22 July 2003 in which claim 1 has been amended. Claims 1-20 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Reisman (hereinafter "Reisman", 6,658,464).

As per Claim 1, Reisman teaches a computer-implemented local resource access system, comprising:

a computer (at least col. 6:19-25; computer workstation);

an initiating program, executing on the computer, that has a link to access a local resource (at least col. 36:21-49; local browser with 'active' hyperlinks of local content);

a local application, executing on the computer, having an instruction that generates a request for access to a local resource based on the link to access the local resource, the request including a token and having the form of a hyperlink and wherein the local resource is not accessible directly from the initiating program (at least col. 36:22-37:32; also col. 52:35- 53:54; link manager and relocator for browser hyperlink for local content); and

a translator program, executing on the computer, that receives the access request from the local application, the translator program further comprising instructions that generate a return token in response to the access request and instruction that return the return token to the initiating program, the return token further comprising a hyperlink containing a path to the local resource (at least col. 36 line 22 – col. 37 line 32; col. 43, lines 12-60; col. 45:49-50:24; link interceptor/ translator).

As per Claim 2. The system of claim 1, wherein the local application further comprises an instruction that receives the return token and an instruction that launches an application to execute the local resource pointed to by the return token (at least col. 36 line 22 – col. 37 line 48; col. 43, lines 25-47; eg. completion of calling link).

As per Claim 3. The system of claim 1, wherein the translator program further comprises a local application that is part of a media delivery system (at least col. 36 line 22 – col. 37 line 48; col. 43, lines 12-60).

As per Claim 4. The system of claim 3, wherein the translator program further comprises a local server that is part of a media delivery system (at least col. 36 line 22 – col. 37 line 48; col. 43, lines 12-60; server).

As per Claim 5. The system of claim 1, wherein the translator program further comprises a web page plug-in and wherein the initiating program further comprises a web page (at least col. 36 line 22 – col. 37 line 32; col. 43, lines 12-60; col. 44, lines 1-19; plugin, web pages).

As per Claim 6. The system of claim 1, wherein the initiating program further comprises an e-mail client application (at least col. 52, lines 33-67; email).

As per Claim 7. The system of claim 1, wherein the initiating program further comprises a messaging client application (at least col. 52, lines 33-67; email).

As per Claim 8. The system of claim 1, wherein the translator program further comprises an instruction that applies a network security policy to the return token wherein a validated return token is returned to the initiating program if the network security policy is satisfied (at least col. 44, lines 20-37; proxy server for security, firewall).

As per Claim 9. The system of claim 8, wherein the network security policy returns an error report if the network security policy is not satisfied (at least col. 44, lines 20-37; proxy server for security, firewall).

As per Claim 10. The system of claim 5, wherein the translator program further comprises an instruction that applies a network security policy to the return token wherein a validated return token is returned to the initiating program if the network security policy is satisfied (at least col. 44, lines 20-37; proxy server for security, firewall).

As per Claim 11. The system of claim 10, wherein the network security policy returns an error report if the network security policy is not satisfied (at least col. 44, lines 20-37; proxy server for security, firewall).

As per Claim 12. The system of claim 10, wherein the initiating program further comprises a java script that generates a hyperlink to the local resource if the validated return token is returned (at least col. 39, lines 30-48; col. 37, lines 1-48; java).

As per Claim 13. The system of claim 1, wherein the return token generation instruction further comprises an instruction for determining the type of hyperlink to be sent to the initiating program (at least col. 36 line 22 – col. 37 line 32; col. 43, lines 12-60; eg. filename).

As per Claim 14. The system of claim 13, wherein the type of hyperlink comprises one of a localhost link, a loopback link, a file link and a protocol link (at least col. 36 line 22 – col. 37 line 32; col. 43, lines 12-60; col. 45 line 65 – col. 46 line 24).

Claims 15-20 do not substantially add or define any additional limitations over claims 1-14 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 18 March 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues Reisman does not teach an initiating program claim element. Applicant argues Reisman requires a different browser from the 'typical web browser'.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., typical web browser) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Reisman teaches a web browser, and while, indeed, it is primarily used for offline browsing, Reisman's offline browser does still go online when needed (col. 37:14-21) and that the browser is indeed a normal browser, it would just be catered for use primarily in an offline mode (col. 34:17-35:36). Applicant also clearly specifies in Arguments (p. 5 last paragraph) that the initiating program is a web browser. All web browsers are different and the argument that the web browser of Reisman is atypical in that it performs differently from a typical browser, of which such typical browser capabilities are undefined, is not persuasive, as the Reisman initiating program is a web browser that can go online.

Applicant also argues Reisman does not teach a local application claim element having an instruction that generates a request for access to a local resource, the

request including a token and having the form of a hyperlink and wherein the local resource is not accessible directly from the initiating program. However, Reisman, as discussed below with relation to the translator program, teaches that the initiating program (offline browser) cannot directly access the URL and must use translation to access the respective link (at least col. 43, lines 12-60). Further, as the disclosure suggests, an initiating program may also be email related, which Reisman also touches upon, retrieving email and then local resources can be linked to and used when the user is offline reading the email (see col. 52 line 35 - col. 53 line 65). Further, "wherein the local resource is not accessible directly from the initiating program" is overly broad and comprises a variety of different interpretations, such as the local resource is a file on the user's local disk drive that is accessed via the link, or the local resource is a link requiring use of a different application such as a media player/ explorer, or the local resource is not accessible directly as it requires a connection to download the resource over the connection, or as the example above with Reisman wherein the initiating program email application links to a web browser application to view the local resource for offline viewing, a browser having a link to an email address which brings up the default email program, etc. Thus, Reisman teaches "the request including a token and having the form of a hyperlink and wherein the local resource is not accessible directly from the initiating program".

Applicant further argues Reisman does not teach a translator program claim element that receives the access request from the local application, the translator program further comprising instructions that generate a return token in response to the

access request and instruction that return the return token to the initiating program, the return token further comprising a hyperlink containing a path to the local resource. However, Reisman clearly teaches a link interceptor and translator, which intercepts the initiating program's (in this case offline browser) link request, translates it, and passes the translation back to the offline browser for completion (at least col. 36 line 22 – col. 37 line 32; col. 43, lines 12-60; col. 45:49-50:24; link interceptor/ translator for coding links using extension such as "tsh").

Further, Applicant has not responded to the previous Office Action's request for clarification in the September 2009 Response to Arguments. The previous amendments have added a 'link' to the claims and the claims are vague in how the links/hyperlinks differ. The initiating program has a link to the local resource, while the local application generates a request having the form of a hyperlink, and the translator program generates a return token comprising a path to the local resource. First, it is not clear if the link is different somehow than the hyperlink(s). Second, if they are the same, the initiating program has a link to access the local resource and is ultimately returned a hyperlink containing a path to the local resource. It is not clear, in the claims, if anything is really happening, or at the most, the 'access' does not contain the proper 'path'. Clarification is again requested.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Newly cited Case et al (browser accessing local file via pathname; col. 5:26-67), in addition to previously cited Cianfrocca et al, Pallmann, Simpson et al, Bellotti et al, and Beged-Dov et al are cited for disclosing pertinent information related to the claimed invention. Applicants are requested to consider the prior art reference for relevant teachings when responding to this office action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to GREGORY G. TODD whose telephone number is (571)272-4011. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571)272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/G. G. T./
Examiner, Art Unit 2457

/ARIO ETIENNE/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2457